



SEAC

NEWSLETTER

SOUTHEASTERN ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONFERENCE • Volume 26, No. 2 • 1984

Subscription Information

The SEAC *Newsletter* is published biannually in April and October by the Southeastern Archaeological Conference. Subscription is by membership in the SEAC. Dues for annual membership are \$15 for individuals, \$17.50 for family, \$25 for institutions, \$150 for life, and \$175 for family life. Membership includes two issues of *Southeastern Archaeology* and two newsletters. Requests for memberships, subscriptions, dues, and changes of address should be addressed to the treasurer, orders for back issues and manuscripts for publication in *Southeastern Archaeology* to the *Southeastern Archaeology* editor, and *Newsletter* items to the Associate Editor

Officers

President: Jefferson Chapman, Department of Anthropology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37916. Tel [615] 974-4408. 1982-1983.

Secretary: Marvin D. Jeter, The Center for American Archeology, Kampsville Archeological Center, Kampsville, IL 62053. 1982-1984.

Treasurer: Ann Cordell, Florida State Museum, Department of Anthropology, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611. Tel [904] 392-1721. 1983-1984.

Editor: William H. Marquardt, Florida State Museum, Department of Anthropology, Gainesville, FL 32611. Tel [904] 392-7188. 1982-1984.

Editor-elect: Vincas P. Steponaitis, Department of Anthropology, SUNY, Binghamton, NY 13901. Tel [607] 798-2737 ext. 2121. 1984.

Associate Editor: David H. Dye, Department of Anthropology, Memphis State University, Memphis, TN 38152. Tel [901] 454-2080.

Executive Officer II: Stephen Williams, Peabody Museum, Harvard University, 11 Divinity AV, Cambridge, MA 02138. Tel [617] 495-2250. 1982-1983.

ISSN 0194-2808

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

**The Potential of Materials Science Approaches in the Study of Virginia Ceramics:
An Overview by Gordon Bronitsky..... 15**

Current Research

**Florida
University of Florida and
Florida State Museum 21**

**Kentucky
Association for Anthropological Research..... 22**

**South Carolina
Carolina Archaeological Services 23**

In Memoriam — Charles Herron Fairbanks 24

Notes

Call for Papers (1984 SEAC)..... 24

**Guide to Contractors in Cultural Resource
Management..... 24**

**Southeastern Regional Conference
in CRM Archaeology..... 25**

Ceramic Notes 25

“Great Wines of SEAC” Strikes Again!..... 26

THE POTENTIAL OF MATERIALS SCIENCE
APPROACHES IN THE STUDY OF VIRGINIA
CERAMICS: AN OVERVIEW

To the uninitiated, the ceramics of Virginia present a confusing picture. A wide variety of named types exist, based first on distinctions in technology such as shape, rim profile, paste, temper, firing and texture and, secondly, on surface manipulation (e.g., Evans 1955:38). Many types have not been well-reported or thoroughly compared to existing ones. All too often radiocarbon dates and stratigraphic placement of ceramic types are lacking. One of the earliest attempts to establish an absolute chronological sequence for area ceramics was Wright's publication of An Archaeological Sequence in the Middle Chesapeake Region (1973). Here he defined a series of phases primarily on the basis of ceramic change and shifts in subsistence and settlement patterns. Even so, later work reversed the temporal placement of this Late Woodland sequence (Clark 1976; Griffith 1976). Calls for further analysis of the ceramic sequence abound in the literature (e.g., Artusy 1976; Gregory 1980; MacCord 1974; Reinhart 1979; Winfree 1972).

Research underway at Virginia Commonwealth University is investigating the utility of selected analytical approaches from the discipline of materials science toward the characterization of ceramics in the archaeological study of social and economic change. Characterization describes those features of composition and structure of a material which are important for the preparation of a product, the study of its properties, or its ultimate use (Hench 1971:1). Archaeologists have been aware of the existence of a variety of measures for ceramic characterization and their potential utility in archaeological research at least since the pioneer work of Shepard (1957; see Matson 1952 for a review of earlier studies). Until recently, little use has been made of such measures beyond an increased emphasis on analysis of materials for provenience studies. The neglect of other aspects of ceramic characterization has not stemmed from the inconclusiveness nor complexity of the methods, but rather from the absence of theoretical problems for which such data would be relevant (see

Shepard 1966). Most studies have regarded technological aspects of ceramics such as temper, wall thickness and so on as due primarily to idiosyncratic cultural and individual preference. Most ceramic studies have focused on the construction of descriptive typologies as a basis for the establishment of temporal frameworks and cultural boundaries. For such purposes, stylistic attributes often are most easily analyzed and most sensitive to temporal and social variability. Accordingly, archaeological analysis of a ceramic collection in such a case would simply provide an additional data appendix which would be both costly and relatively meaningless.

Recent archaeological research has suggested that changes in ceramic technology, such as shifts in types, grades, or amounts of temper, have ramifications beyond simple changes in cultural preferences. In the Midwest, Braun has demonstrated a relationship between shifts in temper and types and increased dependence on maize due to physical properties of shell temper which enabled vessels to better withstand repeated heating and cooling cycles which occur in cooking of maize-based stews and gruels. Decreasing thickness of vessel walls through time was another mechanism employed by prehistoric potters to further reduce breakage due to thermal shock (Braun 1978, 1983). Other research has examined the relationship between size grades of temper and vessel resistance to mechanical stress and thermal shock (Steponaitis 1981, 1982a, 1982b). Still other work has pointed out the link between changes in physical characteristics of ceramics and the rise of specialized social and production systems (e.g., Bronitsky 1982, 1984; Rice 1981; Rye 1981).

The study of such production changes involves, first, an analysis of sources of ceramic materials. The shift to specialized production is often manifested in a decline in production sources co-occurring with an increase in the real distributions of such wares. Ceramics and clay sources are currently undergoing analysis through a variety of techniques, including petrographic analysis, sedimentary analysis, and x-ray diffraction. This analysis will be a first step in understanding the relationship between changes in ceramic

technology and the rise of complex societies, for Virginia offers an invaluable data base for the study of the development of social complexity.

Available ethnohistoric and archaeological evidence indicates the Woodland period was one of increasing social differentiation, culminating in the historic Powhatan confederacy encountered by English colonists. This society controlled much of the area below the fall-line and was characterized by inherited ranked statuses and the centralized control of economic production (Turner 1976); some have even called the confederacy a "small-scale monarchy" (Feest 1978: 261). In contrast, contemporaneous societies in the piedmont area above the fall-line were organized into assemblages of relatively autonomous social groups (Mouer 1980, 1981).

The considerable time depth of the Virginia ceramic sequence provides an excellent opportunity to look at yet another aspect of ceramic change, namely the increasing standardization of particular wares and the increasing skill of potters in achieving the standards of acceptability (Rice 1981:222). Such standardization is a concomitant of specialized production (see Rice 1981; Rathje 1975). Here archaeologists are just beginning to tap the resources of materials analysis (e.g., Braun 1982; Rice 1981; Rye 1976; Steponaitis 1979, 1981). A vast literature deals with suitability of different clays and materials for differing ceramic functions. There is also an ongoing concern in this field with ceramic products and manufacturing processes, as evident in the literature dealing with characterization of ceramics in terms of factors relating to product function, reliability, and durability (e.g., Allen 1968; Azaroff 1963; Coble 1958; Davidge 1969, 1974, 1979; Dinsdale, Camm, and Wilkinson 1967; Gericke 1974; Grim 1968; Hadden and Sedlacek 1968; Hasselman 1969, 1970; Jones and Berard 1972; Kirchner 1979; Koenig 1949; Norton 1974; Van Vlack 1964, 1968, 1980; Wolkodoff et al. 1968).

Current research at Virginia Commonwealth University has initiated studies of ceramic paste and temper composition, test of thermal shock, impact resistance, hardness, and chipping resistance in order to assess changes in technology and ceramic

expertise in central Virginia. Studies of modern non-Western potters (e.g., Rye 1981) indicate that, as ceramic specialization develops, potters become more capable of producing vessels technologically designed for different function (see Ericson et al. 1971; Steponaitis 1979, 1981, 1982a, 1982b). Further, as specialized production increases, vessels within the same functional classes should exhibit greater consistency of materials and test performances. Individual potters producing for household consumption generally employ a broader range of clay and temper materials, as well as more variable production methods and design styles. In this research program, the use of petrographic and other methods of provenience analysis, already well established in archaeological analysis (see Peacock 1970 for one review), has already begun to provide a baseline for cross-checking information about specialized production derived from the materials testing program.

Although pioneers such as Shepard called for the use of ceramic technological analyses in archaeological research (e.g., 1942, 1957; earlier studies in Matson 1952), the use of these techniques to provide information beyond provenience data received new impetus in the late 1960s (e.g., Ericson et al. 1971; Matson 1971). Current research has focused primarily on the relationship of vessel function to thermal shock resistance capabilities. Most of these studies, however, have assumed rather than tested links between features such as wall thickness and thermal shock resistance (e.g., Braun 1978, 1983; see Steponaitis 1981, 1982a, 1982b, for an actual attempt to test some of these relationships). Research has already begun to systematically test this link as well as the link between vessel function and differential materials performance.

The Virginia Commonwealth University research program will provide crucial information to archaeologists concerned with function of ceramics, changes in ceramic technology and the nature of these changes in regard to larger changes in socioeconomic systems (e.g., Rice 1981; Rye 1971; Smith 1980; Steponaitis 1979, 1982a, 1982b; Van der Leeuw 1981). Ultimately, this work may enable archaeologists to estimate the fitness of particular

ceramic techniques and materials for specific functions. It has the potential to further provide a means of assessing the expertise of particular potters in producing vessels for these functions. Accordingly, it may also begin to resolve some of the confusion of Virginia ceramics by looking at materials and their relationship to different vessel functions in differing socioeconomic contexts (see Mouer and Bronitsky 1981). Through an understanding of changes in vessel composition and performance, we may then be able to relate the array of surface finishes, tempers, paste materials, shapes, and rim profiles produced by prehistoric Virginia potters to changes in the social and economic systems of which they were an integral part.

REFERENCES

- Allen, A.
1968 Optical Microscopy in Ceramic Engineering. In Ceramic Microstructures, edited by R. Fulrath and J. Pask, pp. 121-159. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Artusy, R.
1976 An Overview of the Proposed Ceramic Sequence in Southern Delaware. Maryland Archaeology 12(2):1-15.
- Azaroff, L.
1968 Properties and Crystal Structure of Materials. In The Physics and Chemistry of Ceramics, edited by C. Klingsberg, pp. 30-44. Gordon and Breach, New York.
- Braun, D.
1978 Woodland Ceramic Technology and Chronological Implications. Paper presented at the Midwest Archaeological Conference, Bloomington, Indiana.
1983 Pots as Tools. In The Hammer Theory of Archaeological Research, edited by A. Keene and J. Moore, pp. 107-134. Academic Press, New York.
- Bronitsky, G.
1982 Technological Assessment of Southwestern Ceramics. In Mogollon Archaeology: Proceedings of the 1980 Mogollon Conference, edited by P. Beckett and K. Silverbird, pp. 279-287. Acoma Books, California.
1984 Materials Science Approaches in Archaeology: A Southwestern Example. The Kiva, in press.
- Clark, W.
1976 The Application of Regional Research Designs to Contract Archaeology: The Northwest Transportation Corridor Archaeological Survey Project. Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Anthropology, American University.
- Coble, R.
1958 Effect of Microstructure on the Mechanical Properties of Ceramic Materials. In Ceramic Fabrication Processes, edited by W. Klingery, pp. 213-228. MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Davidge, R.
1969 Mechanical Properties of Ceramic Materials. Contemporary Physics 10(2): 105-124.

- 1974 Effects of Microstructures on the Mechanical Properties of Ceramics. In Fracture Mechanics of Ceramics, Vol. 2, Microstructure, Materials and Applications, edited by R. Bradt, D. Hasselman, and F. Lange, pp. 447-468. Plenum, New York.
- 1979 Mechanical Behavior of Ceramics. Cambridge Press, London.
- Dinsdale, A., J. Camm, and W. Wilkinson
1967 The Mechanical Strength of Ceramic Tableware. Transactions of British Ceramic Society 66:367-404.
- Ericson, J., D. Read and C. Burke
1971 Research Design: The Relationships between the Primary Functions and the Physical Properties of Ceramic Vessels and Their Implications for Ceramic Distributions on an Archaeological Site. Anthropology UCLA 3(2):84-95.
- Evans, C.
1955 A Ceramic Study of Virginia Archaeology. Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 160.
- Feest, C.
1978 Virginia Algonquians. In Northeast, edited by Bruce Trigger, pp. 253-270. Handbook of North American Indians, vol. 15, William G. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Gericke, O.
1974 Overview of Nondestructive Inspection Techniques. In Fracture Mechanics of Ceramics, Vol. 1, Concepts, Flaws and Fractography, edited by R. Bradt, D. Hasselman and F. Lange, pp. 117-160. Plenum, New York.
- Gregory, L.
1976 The Hatch Site: A Preliminary Report (Prince George County, VA). Archaeological Society of Virginia Quarterly Bulletin 34 (4):239-248.
- Griffith, D.
1976 Ecological Studies of Prehistory. In Transactions of the Delaware Academy of Science, vols. 5-6, edited by J. Kraft, pp. 63-81. Delaware Academy of Science, Newark.
- Grim, R.
1968 Clay Mineralogy. 2nd ed. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Halden, F. and R. Sedlacek
1968 Strength of Commercial Ceramics. In Ceramic Microstructures, edited by R. Fulrath and J. Pask, pp. 431-442. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Hasselman, D.
1969 Unified Theory of Thermal Shock Fracture Initiation and Crack Propagation in Brittle Ceramics. Journal of American Ceramic Society 52(11):600-604.
- 1970 Thermal Stress Resistance Parameters for Brittle Refractory Ceramics: A Compendium. Bulletin of American Ceramic Society 49(12):1-5.
- Hench, L.
1971 Introduction to the Characterization of Ceramics. In Characterization of Ceramics, edited by L. Hench and R. Gould, pp. 1-5. Marcel Dekker, New York.
- Jones, J. and M. Berard
1972 Ceramics: Industrial Processing and Testing. Iowa State University, Ames.
- Kirchner, H.
1979 Strengthening of Ceramics. Marcel Dekker, New York.

- Koenig, J.
1939 Physical Properties of Commercial Dinnerware. Engineering Experiment Station, Bulletin 101. Ohio State University Studies in Engineering Series 8(3).
- MacCord, H.
1974 The Refo Site, Matthews County, Virginia. Archaeological Society of Virginia Quarterly Bulletin 29(1):33-39.
- Matson, F.
1952 The Contribution of Technical Ceramic Studies to American Archaeology. In Prehistoric Pottery of the Eastern United States, edited by J. Griffin, Anthropological Papers of the Museum of Anthropology No. 2, University of Michigan.
1971 A Study of Temperatures Used in Firing Ancient Mesopotamian Pottery. In Science and Archaeology, edited by R. Brill, pp. 65-79. MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Mouer, L.
1980 Barbarians and Hillbillies: Social Perceptions and Regional Boundaries in the Late Woodland Societies of Eastern and Central Virginia. Paper presented at Annual Meeting, Eastern States Archaeological Federation, Albany, New York.
1981 Powhatan and Monacan Regional Settlement Hierarchies: A Model of Relationship Between Social and Environmental Structure. Archaeological Society of Virginia Quarterly Bulletin 36 (1-2):1-21.
- Mouer, L. and G. Bronitsky
1981 Temper! Temper! Paper presented at Annual Meeting of Archaeological Society of Virginia.
- Norton, F.
1974 Elements of Ceramics. 2nd ed. Addison-Wesley, Reading.
- Peacock, D.
1970 The Scientific Analysis of Ancient Ceramics: A Review. World Archaeology 1(3):375-389.
- Rathje, W.
1975 The Last Tango in Mayapan: A Tentative Trajectory and Production Distribution Systems. In Ancient Civilization and Trade edited by J. Sabloff and C. Lamberg-Karlovsky, pp. 409-448. University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.
- Reinhart, T.
1979 Middle and Late Archaic Cultures in the Lower James River Area. Archaeological Society of Virginia Quarterly Bulletin 34(2):57-82.
- Rice, P.
1981 Evolution of Specialized Production: A Trial Mode. Current Anthropology 22(3):219-227.
- Rye, O.
1976 Keeping Your Temper Under Control: Materials and Manufacture of Papuan Pottery. Archaeology and Physical Anthropology in Oceania 11:106-137.
1981 Pottery Technology: Principles and Reconstruction. Taraxacum, Washington, D.C.
- Shepard, A.
1942 Rio Grande Glaze Point Ware: A Study Illustrating the Place of Ceramic Technological Analysis in Archaeological Research. Carnegie Institute of Washington, Publication 528:129-262.
1957 Ceramics for the Archaeologist. Carnegie Institute of Washington, Publication 609.
- Shepard, A.
1966 Problems in Pottery Analysis. American Antiquity 31(6):870-871.

- Smith, M.
1980 Archaeological Ceramics as Vessels: Relating Morphology to Utilitarian Function. Paper presented at the 45th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Philadelphia.
- Steponaitis, V.
1979 Prehistoric Pottery from Moundville, Alabama: Some Technological Findings. Lecture delivered at National Bureau of Standards, August 14, 1979.
1981 A Possible Technological Explanation for the Distinction Between Coarse and Fine Shell-Tempered Ceramics in Mississippian Assemblages. Paper presented at the 46th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, San Diego.
1982a Ceramics, Chronology and Community Patterns: An Archaeological Study at Moundville. Academic Press, New York.
1982b Technological Studies of Prehistoric Pottery for Alabama: Physical Properties and Vessel Function. Paper presented at the Wenner-Gren Symposium, "Multidimensional Approaches to the Study of Ancient Ceramics," Lhee, Netherlands.
- Turner, R.
1976 An Archaeological and Ethnohistorical Study of the Evolution of Rank Societies in the Virginia Coastal Plain. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology Pennsylvania State University.
- Van der Leeuw, S.
1981 An Archaeologist Asks Questions. Paper presented at the 46th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, San Diego, California.
- Van Vlack, L.
1964 Physical Ceramics for Engineers. Addison-Wesley, Reading.
1968 Ceramic Microstructures. In Ceramic Microstructures, edited by R. Fulrath and J. Pask, pp. 1-21. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
1980 Elements of Materials Science and Engineering, 4th ed. Addison-Wesley, Reading.
- Winfree, R.
1972 A New Look at Cord-Marked Pottery. Archaeological Society of Virginia Quarterly Bulletin 26(4):179-189.
- Wolkodoff, V., L. Ferreria and R. Weaver
1968 Ceramic Surfaces and Relationship to Internal Microstructures. In Ceramic Microsturctures, edited by R. Fulrath and J. Pask, pp. 297-309. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Wright, H.
1973 An Archaeological Sequence in the Middle Chesapeake Drainage. Maryland Geological Survey, Baltimore.
- Gordon Bronitsky
Department of Anthropology
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721

Florida

University of Florida and the Florida State Museum. Recent discoveries unearthed in a vast interior wetlands area of central Florida may permit a dramatic new understanding of the Indian life that flourished here at the time of European contact. Brent Weisman (University of Florida), and a team of volunteers from the Withlacoochee River Archaeology Council (WRAC) located an intact Safety Harbor period burial mound, now known as the Tatham site, in the "Cove of the Withlacoochee" a remote swampland 103 km northeast of Tampa. An archaeological survey of Cove was initiated in 1983 by Weisman and WRAC, hoping to identify and document Second Seminole War period Seminole Indian sites, including the stronghold of the famed leader Osceola. It was during the search for Osceola's village that the Tatham mound was discovered.

The Tatham mound is 20 m in diameter and 2 m high. The only evident site disturbance is a 35 cm diameter gopher tortoise burrow in the mound's southwest quadrant. Borrow pits are located to the north and east of the mound, both extending to within 3 m of its base. There may be a ramp or causeway at the mound's eastern edge, although more detailed mapping will be necessary to define fully this feature.

Three 50 cm x 50 cm shovel tests were placed in the mound area by Weisman and Jeffrey Mitchem, of the University of Florida. Excavation in the first of these units, on the top of the mound about 4 m northwest of its center, was halted at a depth of 20 cm when human skeletal material was encountered, including portions of a skullcap and longbone fragments. In the fill just above the skeletal remains, a large piece of a Pinellas Incised bowl was recovered, as well as smaller Safety Harbor Incised sherds and a Pinellas drill point. The other tests revealed that the fill may extend to the east of the mound itself, flanking the east side borrow pit.

The discovery of the Tatham mound, while exciting, provides only a piece of the puzzle presented by inland Safety Harbor culture. A remaining challenge is

to determine which, if any, of the shell middens on the nearby Withlacoochee River represent an associated Safety Harbor village. Recognizing such a village may not be easy because at present it is not known what inland Safety Harbor village pottery might look like. Several middens, containing cordmarked and chalky paste check stamped pottery, are under investigation in this regard.

Another inland Safety Harbor period site, the Ruth Smith mound (8-Ci-200), is located approximately 11 km northwest of Tatham. Unlike Tatham, the Ruth Smith mound was well known to local raiders, and many artifacts of Spanish origin, including Nueva Cadiz, chevron, and silver beads were removed from the site over the years. The mound itself was leveled several years ago in a pasture improvement program.

Weisman and Mitchem coordinated a group of 44 WRAC volunteers in a one day salvage excavation at Ruth Smith. Excavation was designed to provide a systematic collection of artifacts and to determine if any subsurface features were remaining. Data suggest that the mound may have in part served a burial function, with bodies being interred with caches of projectile points, pottery, and Spanish goods. The relationship between Ruth Smith and Tatham is still unclear. A detailed report describing the Ruth Smith work is in preparation.

The Safety Harbor culture is primarily thought of as a late Gulf coast phenomenon, well developed by A.D. 1400 and centered around Tampa Bay. Its material culture reflects in situ Weeden Island influences, as well as Fort Walton and Mississippian attributes imported from the north. Historically, the Safety Harbor peoples of the Tampa Bay region are known as the Tocobaga Indians, first contacted by Spanish explorers early in the sixteenth century. According to DeSoto expedition chroniclers, Florida at this time was divided by the Indians into territories or provinces, each ruled by a powerful chief. Inland, archaeologists have had difficulty delineating these provinces, and understanding the complex relationships between them. Further work at the Tatham mound and other sites in the Cove of the Withlacoochee, planned for 1985, may be crucial in understanding the dynamics of late

aboriginal and contact period politics in Florida.

Brent Weisman
Graduate Assistant
Department of Anthropology
Florida State Museum
Gainesville, FL 32611

Kentucky

Association for Anthropological Research. For the last two years Thomas Gatus and William Marquardt, under the auspices of the Association for Anthropological Research, Inc. have been conducting a multiphase Early Man project in western Kentucky. Monies provided by the Historic Preservation Fund, and administered by the Kentucky Heritage Council, have been the main source of financial support.

During the first season (1983) research problems began to focus on Paleo-Indian chronology, the identification of potential functional variation among Paleo-Indian sites, environmental and subsistence reconstruction, and raw material procurement patterns. As a result of a review of various files at the Kentucky Office of State Archaeology, 59 sites were evaluated for their potential to yield intact deposits. From among these, approximately 10 to 12 were found to hold such potential. These sites were geographically diverse, located as far east as Grayson County, west-central Kentucky and as far west as Ballard County, on the Mississippi River. The records also revealed two site concentrations of considerable interest: one in Christian County which consisted of Clovis and other Early Paleo-Indian components, and one in Graves County which consisted primarily of Transitional Paleo-Indian to Early Archaic sites.

Subsequent to field reconnaissance by both Principal Investigators and project ge archaeologist, Elizabeth K. Leach, test units were opened on 4 sites. One site proved to have no subsurface cultural integrity. Two others produced early materials, primarily in the surface collections, but failed to yield isolable subsurface Paleo-Indian or Transitional Paleo-Indian deposits. A fourth site appeared to consist of a virtually pure Harpeth River com-

ponent with 10 to 15 cm of intact subsurface deposits. Identified initially by an amateur, the Youngblood site produced over 100 Harpeth River projectile points from a small area (.45 ha). Preliminary interpretations are that the Youngblood site functioned primarily as a hunting and butchering camp. Although tool maintenance was performed, the overall tool assemblage reveals a limited variety of tools. An apparent concentration of cultural debris within a small area suggests an intense but short-lived occupation. The fact that the site is located away from the main topographic prominence overlooking the confluence of Panther Creek and Clarks River, indicates either a lack of concern with such a vantage point, or a conscious attempt to remain inconspicuous to riverine occupants, whether animal or human. The possibility that the site is located in such a way to enhance hunting, particularly along a trail leading from the bottomlands to the upland, cannot be discounted. If the Harpeth River projectile points are unquestionable Transitional Paleo-Indian in origin, the Youngblood site will assume a high level of regional prehistoric significance.

The second season of work at the Youngblood site consisted of an extensive testing program designed to locate intact subsurface features and to provide data necessary for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. Three days from the end of the field season and, after opening 13 test units, we recovered a pit feature. The exposed portion of the feature was taken for flotation. Radiocarbon samples have been submitted to Beta Analytic and both light and heavy fractions are currently under analysis.

It became apparent during the 1983 season that many of the Paleo-Indian sites that we visited, or hoped to visit, were exposed and damaged by erosion. Therefore, we planned to locate relatively undisturbed Paleo-Indian sites along the Little River in Christian and Trigg Counties by a program of deep testing to determine the interface between subsurface Pleistocene and Holocene sediments. Once this interface is identified and mapped, we anticipate testing for cultural deposits. Analysis of the data collected for this phase of the project is also underway.

Results of the 1983 investigations are available in report form from the Association for Anthropological Research, Inc. A report on the 1984 season will be available by the summer of 1985.

In the area of public education, one of AFAR's primary interests, we have received a matching grant from the Kentucky Humanities Council and the Kentucky Heritage Council to produce a slide and tape show on Kentucky's prehistory. The projected audience for this project is primarily young adults and adults. The show will include new art work, depicting aboriginal life from the Paleo-Indian period to the Late Prehistoric, by Virginia Smith (Museum of Anthropology, University of Kentucky). Dr. Patty Jo Watson will serve as project consultant.

Thomas W. Gatus
Association for Anthropological Research,
Inc.
504 Gibson Avenue
Lexington, Kentucky 40504

South Carolina

Carolina Archaeological Services. Mark Clark Expressway Data Recovery Study - A major South Carolina research project is being undertaken by Carolina Archaeological Services and The Charleston Museum (joint venture) within the coastal sector of the state. Federal Highway Administration funding, administered by the S.C. Department of Highways/Public Transportation, has made possible an interdisciplinary study of 18th and 19th century plantation structure, lifeways and rural-urban interchange at a National Register-eligible historic site near Charleston, South Carolina. This site (38BK202), located on the Wando River (Daniel's Island), was initially recorded by Highway Department archaeologists in 1978 and faces impact from construction of a beltway corridor around the cities of North Charleston and Mount Pleasant. Under terms of its CRM responsibilities, the FHWA has contracted for a research oriented, uniquely holistic study of the context, content, structure, and intra/intersite relationships of 38BK202, relative to Euro-American and Afro-American plantation milieux of the South Atlantic coast.

A phased data recovery program focusing on the historic and (minor) prehistoric components identified by prior investigation of the site began in March 1984 with property title searches, deed and probate research, controlled systematic surface collection of the 20+ ha site area, and soil resistivity survey of selected sampling strata. After completion of the initial data collection, cluster maps of artifact distributions and resistivity contour maps will be used in conjunction with historical documentation to structure approximately six weeks of site testing to locate plantation structures, features, and other cultural deposits assignable to the colonial, antebellum, postbellum, and aboriginal periods. While work will necessarily focus on the corridor impact area, discovery and research strategies will also be implemented adjacent to the corridor within verifiable occupation loci. Site testing is expected to be completed by early June 1984. The final field phase of data recovery will span approximately 12 weeks of large-scale block excavation, recovery of floral and faunal remains, and site mapping. Approximately 15 months of analysis, map construction, and preparation of an integrated project study will follow completion of the fieldwork, and a final report is anticipated by summer 1986.

Senior project staff for the Mark Clark Data Recovery project includes Dr. Lesley M. Drucker (Principal Investigator/Archaeologist), Martha A. Zierden (Project Archaeologist), Jeanne A. Calhoun (Project Historian), Ronald W. Anthony and John Goldsborough, Jr. (Field Archaeologists), Susan J. Krantz (Laboratory Supervisor), and Susan H. Jackson (Field/Research Assistant). Major consultant specialists contributing to the final project study will include a zooarchaeologist, ethnobotanist, soil resistivity specialist, geologist, marine conchologist, soil chemist, and radiocarbon dating lab. The project is under the overall coordination and supervision of Dr. Michael B. Trinkley, Staff Archaeologist, SCDHPT.

Lesley M. Drucker
Carolina Archaeological Services
537 Harden St.
Columbia, SC 29205

IN MEMORIAM

Charles Herron Fairbanks

1913 - 1984

Charles H. Fairbanks passed away at his home in Gainesville, Florida, on July 17, 1984, after a long illness. Memorial services were held on July 19 in Gainesville, and he was buried in Macon, Georgia, on July 20. He is survived by his wife, a daughter, a son, two sisters, and one grandchild. Fairbanks was Distinguished Service Professor Emeritus of the Department of Anthropology, University of Florida. A native of Bainbridge, N.Y., he had taught at Florida State University, and had joined the University of Florida in 1963 as chairman, a position he held for eight years. He was a leading expert in southeastern archaeology, having excavated and written about numerous sites of both prehistoric and historic time periods. He was a pioneer in the anthropological investigation of American slavery through his work on slave cabin sites on plantations. His long career in southeastern archaeology began in the Depression era of the 1930s. He received his bachelor's degree from the University of Chicago and his doctorate from the University of Michigan. He served as superintendent of the Ocmulgee National Monument at Macon, Georgia, and as superintendent and archaeologist at Fort Frederica National Monument, St. Simon's Island, Georgia. He was the founder and past president of the Society for Historical Archaeology and, in 1983, was the first recipient of SHA's J.C. Herrington Award for outstanding contributions to the field. He was a life member of the Southeastern Archaeological Conference. His scholarly contributions, innovations, leadership, and teaching and training of students have profoundly enriched anthropological archaeology in the southeastern United States.

NOTES

Call for Papers

The 41st (1984) annual meeting of the Southeastern Archaeological Conference will be held in Pensacola, Florida on November 8-10. Paper and symposium topics should be sent to the conference coordinator, Judith A. Bense. The 42nd (1985) meeting tentatively is scheduled to be held November 6-9, in Birmingham, Alabama and will be chaired by Marvin D. Jeter. For further information concerning the 1984 meeting call or write:

Judith A. Bense
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
University of West Florida
Pensacola, FL 32514
(904) 474-2797

Guide to Contractors in Cultural Resource Management

ArchaeoPress announces the publication of the Guide to Contractors in Cultural Resource Management. This guide represents the only national directory devoted solely to organizations and individuals who provide regular services in archeology and other cultural resources related work. Volume I (1984) of this guide provides detailed profiles of 94 CR organizations from across the United States. A cross-reference allows the identification of contractors by their market areas, and an index allows easy reference to the professionals associated with these contractors. Volume I is prefaced by a discussion on how to evaluate the qualifications and quality of work provided by individual CR contractors. Available for \$8.50 (postage paid) from ArchaeoPress, 1201 Mulvane, Topeka, Kansas 66604.

Southeastern Regional Conference in
CRM Archeology

The Society for American Archaeology is sponsoring regional conferences across the country during the fall of 1984, each intended to examine, re-evaluate and revise the topics and related standards and guidelines formulated in 1974 at the Airlie House Conference. Ten years has elapsed since the Airlie House Report was written, and CRM-related archeology has experienced many changes. Federal statutes have been passed (ARPA) or amended (NHPA), new state planning procedures are beginning (RP3), and most archeologists now are familiar with the requirements of--and problems with--the compliance process. These topics and others are to be the focal points of the regional conferences. Papers issued from each conference will become part of a single document published in 1985 (Son of Airlie House?) on the status of U.S. archeology in cultural resource management.

For the Southeast the conference will be in October, and this announcement is to solicit requests for additional information from those interested in participating. Because this is a working conference, which will end with a draft document in hand, attendance will be limited to 10-20 persons. Delegates will be selected by mid-summer; location and meeting dates also will be available at a later date. If you are interested in participating, or want additional information on the goals or content of the conference, please contact J. Ned Woodall, Southeastern Regional Chairman, Department of Anthropology, Box 7808, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27109.

Ceramic Notes

Occasional Publications of the Ceramic
Technology Laboratory, Florida State Museum

CERAMIC NOTES No. 2, ready for distribution, is a monograph entitled "Ceramic Technology at a Weeden Island Period Archaeological Site in North Florida," by Ann S. Cordell. This monograph, which represents publication of Cordell's master's thesis in anthro-

pology, is a technological analysis of pottery recovered from excavations into village and ceremonial contexts at the McKeithen site in Columbia County, Florida.

The magnificent Weeden Island fired clay vessels and effigy figurines, perhaps the finest ceramics manufactured by aborigines of the eastern United States, were traded north to the fall line, west to the Mississippi River valley, and into south Florida [Cordell's] procedures allow quantified conclusions regarding craft specialization, the dichotomy between mound and village wares, and the location of manufacture of the pottery. These data, the first of their kind for a Weeden Island ceramic assemblage, provide a greater understanding of the evolutionary position and nature of Weeden Island society.

--from the "Foreword," by Jerald T. Milanich,
Curator of Archaeology, Florida State Museum.

Ceramic Technology at a Weeden Island Period Archaeological Site in North Florida, by Ann S. Cordell. CERAMIC NOTES no. 2. Ceramic Technology Laboratory, Florida State Museum, Gainesville, Florida, 1984. xv + 248 pp., 18 figures, 40 tables, 22 appendices. \$8.00 US.

Checks for CERAMIC NOTES no. 2 should be made out in the amount of \$8.00 US, payable to the UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA FOUNDATION. Postage is included. Payment must accompany orders.

Address orders and correspondence to:
Dr. Prudence M. Rice
Ceramic Technology Laboratory
Florida State Museum
Gainesville, FL 32611

"Great Wines of SEAC" Strikes Again!

The Second Annual "Great Wines of SEAC" competition was held on Friday evening, November 4, at the 1983 SEAC meeting in Columbia, SC. More than 30 vintages were available for sampling by a happy throng of well over 100 connoisseurs.

We are grateful to SEAC meeting hosts Stanton Green and Al Goodyear, and to Ms. B. J. Blanchard and her staff at The Town House, for making the Ballroom available to us. A very special "thank you" is due to David Hally of the University of Georgia, who served honorably as judge on very short notice. Another goes to David Brose of the Cleveland Museum of Natural History, who performed yeoman service as Registrar. (By the way, our Research Department has discovered that, back in the old country of Scotland, "brose" means a concoction which includes varying amounts of oatmeal, brown sugar and Scotch whisky; perhaps David will bring us some samples next year.) Finally, we thank the anonymous SEAC member(s) who opened the bottles, and SEAC Editor Bill Marquardt and his staff, who provided a set of Polaroid and Instamatic photos which should enliven the "Archives Corner" of Southeastern Archaeology in a few decades.

Now, on to Judge Hally's awards. In response to suggestions made by several members after the first contest, the "field" was "gridded off" into several categories, as follows:

Southeastern Whites - The winner is "Meredyth October Harvest" Virginia White Wine, vintage 1982, from Meredyth Vineyards, Middleburg, VA, submitted by George Milner of the University of Illinois and the Smithsonian Institution. This is the second year that a Smithsonian inmate has brought in a noteworthy Virginia wine, the previous one being Bruce Smith's "Virginia Cabernet Sauvignon" from Barboursville Vineyards. "Meredyth October Harvest" received the highest point score given by Judge Hally, and is therefore also awarded the prize as 1983 Grand Champion.

Southeastern Reds - In a close competition, the victor is "Rushing Red" from The Winery Rushing, of Merigold, MS submitted by John O'Hear of Mississippi State University. This category also produced the "cutest" bottle, from the Perdido (Ala.) Winery on the famous "Redneck Riviera." It had a little straw hat and a red bandana. Its appellation is Rose Cou Rouge, which translates to Redneck Rose. Thanks to Mary Lucas Powell of Northwestern University for bringing it!

Non-Southeastern Whites - The winner, submitted by Thomas Maher of SUNY-Binghamton, is "Walter St. Bully" 100% New York State White Wine, vintage 1981, from Bully Hill Vineyards of Hammondsport, NY. This is the second year this intriguing vintner has given us a winner (See Non-SE Reds, below). The owner is alleged to have the archaeologically noteworthy name of Walter Taylor, but as he notes on the label, he "cannot legibly use his name on this design because of Federal Court action." The label on this year's winner features a drawing of the "Bully Hill Billy Goat" with the legend, "They have my heritage, but they didn't get my goat." It would appear that the latter is indeed named "Walter St. Bully" and that he is the "Patron of the Estate." The back label includes lists of 14 varieties of grapes used in the blend, the names of 40 growers (percentages of grapes and names of vinyard employees available upon request), some interesting and eccentric philosophical notes, and a sketch of the owner as "the Happy Wine Maker" with the motto, "Wine and Laughter" which is hereby adopted as the Official Motto of "Great Wines of SEAC."

Non-Southeastern Reds - Through an oversight, no wines were entered in this category this year, and no winner was announced at the meeting. It was later discovered that two bottles brought down by yours truly, one from authentic Yankee country and the other from a Border state, had inadvertently been included with the Southeastern Reds. Although they (of course) did not win in that category, they were given respectable (and equal) point scores by Judge Hally, and are thereby

declared co-winners by default. They are "Old Nauvoo Concord," a (very) sweet wine from Nauvoo, Illinois, and "Montaigne Rouge" from the Stone Hill winery of Hermann, MO. It is freely admitted that last year's Grand Champion, "Marechal Foch Special Reserve" from the aforementioned Bully Hill Vineyards, submitted by the aptly named "Vin" Steponaitis, would have won again this year had it been present.

American Grape Wines (Commercial) - A number of interesting scuppernong and muscadine wines showed up, but the catawba wines, which had been expected to make a strong showing in this Carolina setting, were conspicuous by their absence. The winner, nevertheless, was from the host state; it was "Mother Vineyard Scuppernong" from Mother Vineyard Wine Co., of Patrick, SC, submitted by someone whose name looks like "Pat" on the Register. Please reveal your identity!

Wines Made by Real Archaeologists - This year's prize goes to Carol Morrow of S.I.U.-Carbondale, for a nice blueberry wine from "Villa Corruccini-Morrow" alias herself and hubby (a physical anthropologist). Bob Neuman of LSU, last year's

winner with an elderberry, brought in a marigold wine this time, but confessed that it had not been a good year for marigolds. Let's have some more "private enterprise" out there this year!

Other Non-Commercial Wines - For the second straight year, Mrs. Mazel Mire of St. Martinville, LA, wins with her marvelous "Bayou Teche Fig and Raisin Wine" submitted again by Jon Gibson of the University of Southwestern Louisiana (Université des Acadiens). Those Cajuns know how to live!

Congratulations to the winners, and to all the other entrants, all of whom get Honorable Mention. And, here's looking forward to a bigger and better Great Wines III at Pensacola! In particular, we're eager to get into that legendary Florida orange wine that Marquardt, Deagan, Cordell & Co. have been bragging about but haven't yet produced (maybe they couldn't get it past Customs at the Florida state line?). Until then, "Wine and Laughter" to you all.

Marvin D. Jeter, SEAC Secretary
Center for American Archeology
Kampsville, IL 62053

Information For Contributors

The SEAC *Newsletter* is published biannually (April and October) by the Southeastern Archaeological Conference. Original short articles, book reviews, announcements, notes, current research and comments on the archaeology of the southeastern United States should be submitted to the associate editor.

All manuscript material must be typed double-spaced on one side of an 8½ by 11 inch white bond sheet leaving at least a 1 inch margin on all sides. Contributors are referred to *American Antiquity* and the *Chicago Manual of Style* for matters of style and reference. Footnotes are not permitted. Text citations are set in parentheses, e.g., [author 1975:100]. References are listed alphabetically by author and chronologically by year. Style must follow format of this *Newsletter*. Tables should be typed on separate sheets with proper titles and numbered consecutively. A note should be made in the manuscript margin indicating where tables should appear. All illustrations must be submitted as black on white drawings or glossy prints and must not exceed 9 x 12 inches in size. All illustrations are numbered consecutively in a series and are labeled "Figure", whereas all tabular material is numbered in a separate series labeled "Table". Each article must be accompanied by a short abstract.

DEADLINE: April Issue — February 1;
October Issue — August 1.

Current Research - Write in narrative form a summary of your field work or any other project or research which you might normally report upon at a Current Research session. Photographs and line drawings will be accepted. Make your report a concise summary following the format below [if at all possible]. Please include the nature of the project (field school, grant sponsored research, etc.), dates of work, sponsoring institution, person in charge, current status of work, results.

Type of Research

[Federal, State Agency, University, Private Other] Agency [if federal] or State—Agency, or State—University, or State—Private Agency, or individual, or other.

Fieldwork

Laboratory

Publications

New Personnel

Other categories [i.e., other research] Categories not applicable may be omitted from body of text. These headings are only for purpose of organization.

Items published reflect the views of the authors; their publication does not signify endorsement by the Southeastern Archaeological Conference *Newsletter* or the Southeastern Archaeological Conference.

October 1984

VOL 26, NO 2

**William H. Marquardt, Editor, SEAC
129 Florida State Museum
University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32611 U.S.A.**

Nonprofit Org.
U.S. POSTAGE PAID
Permit No. 486
Gainesville, FL 32601

DAVID ANDERSON
MUSEUM OF ANTHROPOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ANN ARBOR

MI 48109

Third Class